

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE**

NITETEK LICENSING LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

STREAMBOX INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 21-CV-713

**COMPLAINT FOR PATENT
INFRINGEMENT**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

COMPLAINT FOR PATENT INFRINGEMENT

Plaintiff Nitetek Licensing LLC (“Plaintiff”), through its attorneys,
complains of Streambox Inc. (“Defendant”), and alleges the following::

PARTIES

1. Plaintiff Nitetek Licensing LLC is a corporation organized and
existing under the laws of Texas that maintains its principal place of business at
6001 W Parmer Ln., Ste 370, 1070 Austin, TX 78727-3908.

2. Defendant Streambox Inc. is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Washington that maintains an established place of business at 1801 130th Ave NE, Suite 200, Bellevue, WA 98005.

JURISDICTION

3. This is an action for patent infringement arising under the patent laws of the United States, Title 35 of the United States Code.

4. This Court has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a).

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because it has engaged in systematic and continuous business activities in this District and is incorporated in this District's state. As described below, Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement giving rise to this action within this District.

VENUE

6. Venue is proper in this District under 28 U.S.C. § 1400(b) because Defendant has committed acts of patent infringement in this District and is incorporated in this District's state.

PATENT-IN-SUIT

1 7. Plaintiff is the assignee of all right, title and interest in United States
2 Patent No. 6,661,783 (the “Patent-in-Suit” or the “’783 Patent”); including all
3 rights to enforce and prosecute actions for infringement and to collect damages for
4 all relevant times against infringers of the Patent-in-Suit. Accordingly, Plaintiff
5 possesses the exclusive right and standing to prosecute the present action for
6 infringement of the Patent-in-Suit by Defendant.
7
8

THE ’783 PATENT

10 8. The ’783 Patent is entitled “CDMA transmission apparatus,” and
11 issued 12/09/2003. The application leading to the ’783 Patent was filed on
12 03/09/1999. A true and correct copy of the ’783 Patent is attached hereto as Exhibit
13 1 and incorporated herein by reference.
14
15

16 9. The ’783 Patent is valid and enforceable.
17
18
19

COUNT I: INFRINGEMENT OF THE ’783 PATENT

20 10. Plaintiff incorporates the above paragraphs herein by reference.
21
22

23 11. **Direct Infringement.** Defendant has directly infringed one or more
24 claims of the ’783 Patent in at least this District by having made, used, offered to
25
26

sell, sold and/or imported, without limitation, at least the Defendant products identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (among the “Exemplary Defendant Products”) that infringe at least the exemplary claims of the ’783 Patent also identified in the charts incorporated into this Count below (the “Exemplary ’783 Patent Claims”) literally or by the doctrine of equivalents. On information and belief, numerous other devices that infringe the claims of the ’783 Patent have been made, used, sold, imported, and offered for sale by Defendant and/or its customers.

12. Defendant also has and continues to directly infringe, literally or under the doctrine of equivalents, the Exemplary ’783 Patent Claims, by having its employees internally test and use these Exemplary Products.

13. Exhibit 2 includes charts comparing the Exemplary ’783 Patent Claims to the Exemplary Defendant Products. As set forth in these charts, the Exemplary Defendant Products practice the technology claimed by the ’783 Patent. Accordingly, the Exemplary Defendant Products incorporated in these charts satisfy all elements of the Exemplary ’783 Patent Claims.

14. Plaintiff therefore incorporates by reference in its allegations herein the claim charts of Exhibit 2.

15. Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages adequate to compensate for Defendants infringement.

JURY DEMAND

1
2 16. Under Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff
3 respectfully requests a trial by jury on all issues so triable.
4

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

5
6 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests the following relief:
7

8 A. A judgment that the '783 Patent is valid and enforceable;
9

10 B. A judgment that Defendant has infringed directly one or more
11 claims of the '783 Patent;
12

13 C. An accounting of all damages not presented at trial;
14

15 D. A judgment that awards Plaintiff all appropriate damages under
16 35 U.S.C. § 284 for Defendants past infringement with respect to the '204
17 Patent
18

19 E. And, if necessary, to adequately compensate Plaintiff for
20 Defendants infringement, an accounting:
21

22 i. that this case be declared exceptional within the meaning of 35
23 U.S.C. § 285 and that Plaintiff be awarded its reasonable attorneys
24 fees against Defendant that it incurs in prosecuting this action;
25
26

1 ii. that Plaintiff be awarded costs, and expenses that it incurs in
2 prosecuting this action; and

3 iii. that Plaintiff be awarded such further relief at law or in equity
4 as the Court deems just and proper.

5 DATED this 28st day of May, 2021.

6
7 By: s/ Philip P. Mann
8 Philip P. Mann, WSBA No. 28860
9 **MANN LAW GROUP PLLC**
10 403 Madison Ave. N. Ste. 240
11 Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
12 Telephone: (206) 436-0900
13 email: phil@mannlawgroup.com

14 Together with:

15 David deBruin (No. 4846)
16 GAWTHROP GREENWOOD, PC
17 3711 Kennett Pike, Suite 100
18 Wilmington, DE 19807
19 302-777-5353
20 email: ddebruin@gawthrop.com

21 **Counsel for Plaintiff**
22 **Nitetek Licensing LLC**